

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
San Francisco Division

J. T., et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ANTIOCH UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,  
et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 18-cv-02992-LB

**ORDER APPROVING MINOR'S  
SETTLEMENT**

Re: ECF No. 104

The plaintiff filed an unopposed motion for the court’s approval of the minor’s compromise.<sup>1</sup> The court can decide the motion without oral argument, *see* N.D. Cal. Civ. L. R. 7-1(b), and grants the motion.

“District courts have a special duty, derived from Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17(c), to safeguard the interests of litigants who are minors.” *Robidoux v. Rosengren*, 638 F.3d 1177, 1181 (9th Cir. 2011). “Rule 17(c) provides, in relevant part, that a district court ‘must appoint a guardian *ad litem* — or issue another appropriate order — to protect a minor or incompetent person who is unrepresented in an action.’” *Id.* (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 17(c)). “In the context of proposed settlements in suits involving minor plaintiffs, this special duty requires a district court

---

<sup>1</sup> Mot. – ECF No. 104; Notice – ECF No. 106. Citations refer to material in the Electronic Case File (“ECF”); pinpoint citations are to the ECF-generated page numbers at the top of documents. The parties consented to the undersigned’s jurisdiction. Joint Consent – ECF No. 102.

1 to ‘conduct its own inquiry to determine whether the settlement serves the best interests of the  
2 minor.’” *Id.* (quoting *Dacanay v. Mendoza*, 573 F.2d 1075, 1080 (9th Cir. 1978)).

3 The Ninth Circuit has also made clear that, in cases involving the settlement of federal claims,  
4 district court judges should “limit the scope of their review to the question whether the net amount  
5 distributed to each minor plaintiff in the settlement is fair and reasonable, in light of the facts of  
6 the case, the minor’s specific claim, and recovery in similar cases,” and should “evaluate the  
7 fairness of each minor plaintiff’s net recovery without regard to the proportion of the total  
8 settlement value designated for adult co-plaintiffs or plaintiffs’ counsel — whose interests the  
9 district court has no special duty to safeguard.” *Id.* at 1181–82 (citing *Dacanay*, 573 F.2d at 1078).

10 In the proceedings before the Office of Administrative Hearings, the District prevailed on all  
11 issues but one, and the student prevailed on a procedural issue about the appropriate participants at  
12 an Individualized Assessment Program (“IEP”) meeting.<sup>2</sup> To remedy the procedural violation  
13 concerning the proper IEP participants, the Administrative Law Judge ordered one hour of training  
14 on required IEP procedures by trainers who were not employed by the District.<sup>3</sup> The plaintiff  
15 appealed, and the case ultimately settled for attorney’s fees and a \$10,000 payment to the student  
16 for funding for programs, classes, and a computer.<sup>4</sup> Given the facts of the case and the minor’s  
17 specific claims, the settlement is fair and reasonable, and the attorney’s fees and costs are  
18 reasonable and appropriate.

19 In sum, the court approves the unopposed minor’s compromise.

20 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

21 Dated: December 9, 2019



22  
23 LAUREL BEELER  
United States Magistrate Judge

24  
25  
26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 <sup>2</sup> Mot. – ECF No. 104 at 3.

28 <sup>3</sup> *Id.*

<sup>4</sup> *Id.* at 3.